

Pam Gregory

Docket No. 06-181

From: Candy Eubanks [dulceangelgirl@yahoo.com]
To: Monica Desai
Cc:
Subject: Re: DA 06-1802, CGB-CC-0005 and CGB-CC-0007
Attachments:

Sent: Thu 10/19/2006 9:32 PM

October 19, 2006

FCC Chief, Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau Monica Desai

Dear Monica Desai,

I protest the FCC approval of almost 300 requests for new programs to be shown without closed captions.

The FCC weakened the closed captioning rules, and appears to have created new standards and new rules for permitting programs to be televised without closed captions. I believe the FCC violated the closed captioning rules.

People who are deaf or hard of hearing want access to televised information and entertainment, just like everyone else.

Closed captioning is an essential part of any televised program. Captioning is not too difficult or too expensive.

I cannot watch television programs that are not captioned.

Please reconsider these FCC decisions and support closed captioning.

Sincerely,

Candy Eubanks
3684 David Lane S.W.
Rochester, MN 55902-1524

FILED/ACCEPTED
OCT 26 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: wimberleyed@aim.com [wimberleyed@aim.com] **Sent:** Wed 9/20/2006 8:53 AM
To: Robert McDowell; Deborah Tate; Kevin Martin; Michael Copps; Monica Desai; Jonathan Adelstein
Cc: bosson@hughes.net
Subject:
Attachments:

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 26 2006

Regarding Mass Exemptions

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

FCC Chair, Commissioners, and Chief,

This is my second email to you all. This mass waiver to the church groups from providing closed captioning does not make sense at all. It just doesn't. What may make sense (as viewed by a political party) if it was done for partisan purpose with an agenda to protect the votes of religious groups for the upcoming elections. If so, that is the wrong reason to provide mass exemptions. It is so wrong - oh how so wrong - to make ruling based on political agenda that will secure votes of religious groups at the expense of loss of functional equivalency. I'm glad to see Digest publishing a couple reports on exemptions, but it is after the FCC got flood of protests - looks like damage control effort to me - so that does not really count.

Audio and captioning are really the same thing in terms of functional equivalency. I've always have had problem with the mentality that captioning cost should be separate from the general programming costs. I believe it is the FCC's role to stress to the TV networks that captioning is simply part of the TV network's overall costs. Over the years, I think FCC tried to impart that; however, the FCC failed miserably in that for the religious groups. When the FCC got lot of requests from many religious groups, I think that the FCC caved in with worrisome idea that it may affect upcoming elections if the FCC continues to reject the request of waivers from the religious groups.

By this mass exemptions, the FCC is setting up a VERY dangerous precedence. A precedence that once set, it will be very difficult to change down in the future. I beg you all to make the right and humane decision. Permanent exemption was particularly very disturbing. My thoughts was how dare you to presume that deaf and hoh do not need closed captioning from religious groups - not ever in the foreseeable future - forever. HOW DARE YOU TO PRESUME THAT!

This is my opinion, and mine alone. Here I represent myself, and not to the Texas Public Utility Commission. I'm speaking as a consumer Ed Bosson. Although past work experience contributed to that, it is not from work that I express this opinion. It is just from a common sense as to the rights of ALL persons. It is so obvious that it pains me to see that the FCC failed to see it.

eyes open & thumbs up,

Ed Bosson

Check Out the new free AIM(R) Mail -- 2 GB of storage and industry-leading spam and email virus protection.

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: Tressa Johnson [tressawj@hotmail.com]
To: Monica Desai
Cc:
Subject: Re: DA 06-1802, CGB-CC-0005 and CGB-CC-0007
Attachments:

Sent: Fri 10/20/2006 5:42 PM

October 20, 2006
FCC Chief, Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau Monica Desai

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 26 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Monica Desai,

I protest the FCC approval of almost 300 requests for new programs to be shown without closed captions.

The FCC weakened the closed captioning rules, and appears to have created new standards and new rules for permitting programs to be televised without closed captions. I believe the FCC violated the closed captioning rules.

People who are deaf or hard of hearing want access to televised information and entertainment, just like everyone else.

Closed captioning is an essential part of any televised program. Captioning is not too difficult or too expensive.

Please reconsider these FCC decisions and support closed captioning.

Sincerely,

Tressa Johnson
1120 W 17th Ave
Eugene, OR 97402-3938

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: Chuck Baird [cbonchin@gmail.com] **Sent:** Thu 10/5/2006 10:20 AM
To: Kevin Martin; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell; Monica Desai
Cc:
Subject: Closed Captions
Attachments:

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 26 2006

Dear Chairman and Commissioners,

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

I am very disappointed and worried at the recent what took place by the FCC. I have just learned that the FCC has made a decision to grant a large number of captioning exemptions. That decision will suffer me like being deaf all my life and just losing both of my invaluable arms, not again! It should not have happened. It should be reversed immediately.

Thanks,

Chuck Baird, Austin, Texas

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: Cheryl Heppner [CHeppner@nvr.org] **Sent:** Sun 9/24/2006 8:53 AM
To: Monica Desai; Kevin Martin; Jonathan Adelstein; Michael Copps; Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell
Cc: Hope Hamilton
Subject: Captioning Waivers
Attachments:

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 26 2006

(Forwarded at the request of M. Hope Hamilton)

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Chairman and Commissioners:

Please, please re-consider your recent decision to grant exemptions from TV captioning. You are the Federal COMMUNICATIONS Commission. You should be encouraging communications, doing everything in your power to ensure that everyone is able to communicate with and be part of the great media in this country—not obstructing communication for the deaf and hard-of-hearing. You should be helping organizations to find ways to process the captioning, instead of telling them: “Okay, you don’t have to do captions.” You are saying essentially that you do not care if everyone has access to television programs.

But you are concerned about their costs and their being able to put their programs on the air. You are concerned about “...hindering the production and distribution of programming.” But that is exactly what you ARE doing with these exemptions. You are hindering the distribution to a large segment of society. Every organization that puts programs on the air has money to do so. Why are you concerned about their costs anyway? That’s not your concern; that’s their problem. And, it’s not a big problem anyway; it’s just that they don’t care, don’t want to bother. Your statement that an organization may “...terminate or substantially curtail its programming...” because of having to do captions is quite ridiculous. Why in the world are you concerned about that anyway? Do you really believe that a program is going to NOT be done just because they have to put captions on it? Wake up. They will do their programs if they want to whatever the cost.

Why are we hard-of-hearing people excluded from mainstream America? Why is it so difficult for those of you who hear well to understand the needs of hearing impaired persons. We want to be able to watch and understand TV shows just like you, but we really need the captioning. Where is your concern for us who need captions to be able to be part of the great communication media? What about us? Why have you chosen to ignore us so completely?

Why does anyone need exemptions from the captioning requirement anyway? Cost? Since when is anyone allowed to not obey a law because it costs too much? It’s ridiculous! If they have the many thousands of dollars to make a TV show, then they have a few more dollars to do the captioning. Anyway, captioning is a very very small part of the cost of putting on a TV show or a movie.

We are struggling to have better captioning, and here you are taking away the poor captioning that we already have. That’s very mean and thoughtless and uncaring.

Are you aware that in the next few years there are going to be many more millions of people who will be needing captions? The “boomer generation” is getting older and many many of them will have impaired hearing because of the extremely loud music they have been listening to.

Thank you for reading this, and please give your consideration to the thoughts I have expressed.

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: Charles C. Estes [cestes335@grandecom.net] **Sent:** Wed 9/20/2006 10:18 AM
To: Kevin Martin; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell; Monica Dean
Cc: News@nccusa.org
Subject: exemption from closed captioning
Attachments:

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 26 2006

Dear FCC Chief and Commissioners:

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

This is in reference to the FCC's recent practices of granting exemptions to religious TV networks from providing closed captioning for their TV programs. It appears that the Federal Communications Commission has sent out 250 more letters granting captioning exemptions. Additionally, it is my understanding that another large number of exemptions are planned that apparently will amount to a total of some 550 exemptions.

Since I am deaf and do not hear the preacher's booming warnings, I depend on closed captioning to follow the message or script in any programming. By pleading for exemption from the cost of captioning, the message these religions bodies are sending me is that they do not want me among their numbers, that my eternal soul is not worthy of redemption and that I may as well go ahead and join the other side. These are the so-called church leaders who know good and well they will receive "the greater condemnation" for their actions.

But equally distressing is the timing of this mass exemption, right up so near the November elections.

Does anyone know any shame any more?

Charles C. Estes
 2281 Carrington Drive
 Mobile, AL 36695

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: CBoryslawskyj [cboryslawskyj@yahoo.com] **Sent:** Tue 9/19/2006 3:32 PM
To: FCCINFO; Kevin Martin; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell
Cc: Monica Desai; Jay Kelthley; Tom.Chandler@fcc.gov; Cheryl King; info@tdi-online.org; info@simmonsforcongress.com
Subject: FCC letter of protest for too many exemptions
Attachments:

Federal Communications Commission
 445 12th Street, SW
 Washington, DC 20054

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 26 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Kevin J. Martin, Chairman
 Michael J. Copps, Commissioner
 Jonathan S. Adelstein, Commissioner
 Deborah Taylor Tate, Commissioner
 Robert M. McDowell, Commissioner
 Dear Commissioners,

I am writing this to express my serious concern about FCC's granting too many exemptions to almost over 90% churches and religion groups, and others. I find their requests for exemption very disturbing and improper because of their largest single audience - the elderly. As you should know, the largest single demographic among hard-of-hearing people is elderly. How would the churches and religion groups preach their audience without any access?

Although these organizations are tax-exempt, they definitely do have some financial assistance from for profit TV stations. Thus, they don't have to pay taxes although these stations provide them extra money to do their captioning - very minimal.

Shame on you, FCC, you are supposed to "enforce" full accessibility in order to ensure all TV or video programming be captioned in accordance with "new programming" - Section 703 (b) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

For your information, the rules indicate specifically about captioning for "8.6% of the nation's population", but this figure is deliberately deceptive. Don't you remember that the closed captioning of TV programming began over 20 years ago? Is there something you think any accomplishment yet but what about audio? Amazing about how fast and growing the sound of TV, radio, movie, and video are revolutionizing today. Yet, how about captioning?

Please do reverse your FCC's September 12, 2006 decisions regarding TV captioning waivers. Enough is enough.

Promote full captioning - your first goal.

Very truly yours,

|s|
 CM Boryslawskyj

39 Clark Hill Rd
East Hampton, CT 06424
Email: eboryslawskyj@yahoo.com

CC:

- U.S. Senator Christopher Dodd
- U.S. House Representative Rob Simmons
- Monica Desai, Chief, Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau
- Jay Keithley, Deputy Chief (Policy) Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau
- Tom Chandler, Chief, Disability Rights Office
- Cheryl King, Deputy Chief, Disability Rights Office
- Telecommunications for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Inc.

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: Cathy Steger [Cathy.Steger@state.tn.us] **Sent:** Mon 10/9/2006 10:00 AM
To: Deborah Tate; Kevin Martin; Michael Copps; Monica Desai; Robert McDowell
Cc:
Subject: I have been working in the field of deaf-blindness for 27 years and now am personally involved with
Attachments:

I have been working in the field of deaf-blindness for 27 years and now am personally involved with a deaf-blind friend. For a few days the captioning on the TV was messed up and he was lost. He reads the paper with his magnifying glass to supplement the TV news, but depends on the TV news. He can not even enjoy a ball game without the captioning. His peripheral vision is too limited to enjoy a ball game at the ball field, or a play, or movie in a theater. TV brings the events to him. Please understand how important captioning is to deaf-blind adults and children alike. PLEASE do not give any stations or programs permanent waivers. They need to find a way to provide this service. Thank you.

Sincerely,
 Cathy Steger

Cathy Steger, Deaf-Blind Coordinator
 Department of Human Services
 Division of Rehabilitation Services
 Services for the Blind and Visually Impaired
 400 Deaderick St. 14th Floor
 Nashville, TN 37248
 615-313-4917 (v) 615-313-6601 (TTY) 615-313-6617 FAX

NOTE: This email may contain PRIVILEGED and CONFIDENTIAL information and is intended only for the use of the specific individual(s) to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient of this email, you are hereby notified that any unauthorized use, dissemination or copying of the information contained in it or attached to it, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please delete it and immediately notify the person above by reply mail. Thank you.

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 26 2006

Federal Communications Commission
 Office of the Secretary

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: Candace K Meinders [cmeinders@usinternet.com]
To: Deborah Tate
Cc: Robert McDowell
Subject: FCC decision on CC
Attachments:

Sent: Sat 9/23/2006 10:35 PM

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 26 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

September 23, 2006

To Commissioners of FCC:

I am a hearing-impaired consumer with one cochlear implant in one ear. I would like to express my displeasure in the Sept. 11 ruling to exempt religious organizations from captioning their programs. I am very upset that such exemptions went out without consulting consumers like myself on this impact.

I read this action on the FCC from the HLAA (Hearing Loss Association of America) e-news advocacy that they send out to their e-subscribers September 14, 2006. I commend the Associate Executive Director of HLAA (formerly SHHH) Brenda Battat on informing her subscribers on this important action.

I have had a hearing loss since childhood and now am in my 40s. I depend on closed-captioning on all my TV programs. My favorite people to watch are Rev. Joel Osteen and Rev. Joyce Meyer. Other good programs or performers are Rev. Kenneth Copeland, Rev. Mac Hammond, Rev. James D Kennedy and Rev. Robert Schuller's Hour of Power.

I don't think it is fair to waive these good programs without consulting the people that depend on closed-captioning. Please let me know that these programs will continue to be close-captioned. My email address is below my home address: Thank you.

In all fairness,

Candace Meinders
8380 Eastwood Rd
Mounds View, MN 55112
cmeinders@usinternet.com

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: Bsteele013@aol.com [Bsteele013@aol.com]**Sent:** Wed 9/20/2006 4:16 PM**To:** Kevin Martin; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell**Cc:** Monica Desai**Subject:** (no subject)**Attachments:**

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 26 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Chairman and Commissioners,

I need your attention:

Please turn the volume OFF on your own television with YOUR FAMILY every day. Also, please turn the volume OFF for the next 1,000 shows and all sports events, especially ALL FOOTBALL GAMES (included the playoff games, all College Bowl Games and the Superbowl and baseball playoff games this fall).

Do not cheat - just turn off the volume OFF on all of your television everyday!!!!
You and your family will love silent shows!!!

After this trial period, if you still feel that it would be a hardship to caption for those people spending all that money to make shows and movies, continue to grant waivers, but if, after having experienced what I experience, you think that understanding and being included and informed is important, please don't grant any waiver for longer than 3 months and don't grant them without very compelling reasons.

My advice to you was to be tough about enforcing the regulations. The regulations had been in effect for 10 years so they had plenty of time to plan for it. If any exemptions were granted at all, they should be short-term exemptions. I never anticipated that our patience of the last 10 years would be rewarded with this terrible decision.

Please hang TOUGH!!!

Bob Steele (deaf Man)

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: Blidfors1@aol.com [Blidfors1@aol.com] **Sent:** Tue 9/19/2006 2:00 PM
To: FCCINFO; Kevin Martin; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell; Monica Desai; Jay Keithley; Tom.Chandler@fcc.gov; Cheryl King; info@tdl-online.org
Cc: Blidfors1@aol.com
Subject: (no subject)
Attachments:

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 26 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

September 18, 2006

TO:

Kevin J. Martin, Chairman
 Michael J. Copps, Commissioner
 Jonathan S. Adelstein, Commissioner
 Deborah Taylor Tate, Commissioner
 Robert M. McDowell, Commissioner

Dear Commissioners,

This is to let you know that I fully support the action alerts from TDI and other national organizations to oppose the decisions taken by the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) on September 12, 2006. We respectfully ask that the FCC reverse its September 12, 2006 decisions regarding television captioning waivers.

Churches make up a very important part of every community. It is within their mission to support the basic needs of all people within their reach. When Hurricane Katrina struck the Gulf Coast one year ago, they were among the first to offer help with shelter, food, and other assistance to the survivors. Captioning TV programs does meet a legitimate basic need for access to information just like building a ramp to the church door. By providing captions to meet the needs of a significant population group, the churches will find themselves with an expanded TV viewership, which will lead to an increase in their membership and other support from the community. When children and adults are able to read captions on spiritual programs, they are influenced to live up to high moral standards and contribute their part to the community. Hearing loss is the number one growing disability among senior citizens – they will find themselves depending on captioning to listen to the message.

We want to participate fully in all programs and services at our local church because it serves as a vital resource that empowers us to be fully integrated in the community. If one of us who are deaf or hard of hearing sees the services with captions on TV, we can interact with other church members, neighbors, fellow employees, family members, and service professionals in the local community. We stand to benefit from the "local connection" that national religious programs are unable to provide.

We know that all video programmers have had ten years to prepare for the captioning regulations now in place, and temporary waivers when appropriate. When you give full permanent exemptions to the two programmers, it reverses all the access we have worked on for years. We ask that programmers consider other possible revenue options such as sponsorships, long-term captioning service agreements, and aftermarket sales (videotapes or DVDs) to cover and minimize the cost of captioning. Or, they can reduce other expenses in their production budgets to enable the provision of captioning.

Closed captioning gives me a) access to news that is indispensable to the community, b) entertainment that is an integral part of our lives, and c) education that paves the way for us to become self-sufficient in society. The information that everyone in the community receives is also important to me and I can only get it if it is captioned.

Thank you for your consideration,

Sincerely,

Robert H. Lidfors
PO Box 1129
Beaverton, OR 97075-1129
Email address: Blidfors1@aol.com

CC:

- Monica Desai, Chief, Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau
- Jay Keithley, Deputy Chief (Policy) Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau
- Tom Chandler, Chief, Disability Rights Office
- Cheryl King, Deputy Chief, Disability Rights Office
- Telecommunications for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Inc.
- US Senator Gordon Smith- US Senator Ron Wyden
- US Representative Peter DeFazio

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: Bill Greene [billeegree@yahoo.com] **Sent:** Mon 9/25/2006 12:21 PM
To: Kevin Martin
Cc: Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; Monica Desai
Subject: Potential new order regarding Closed Caption regulations
Attachments:

Dear Sirs and Madams,

As the parent of a deaf child I am concerned about the new potential exemptions from the existing closed captioning rules. While I agree in spirit that some exemptions, particularly for organizations that do "not receive compensation from video programming distributors from the airing of [their] programs," I am concerned that the new guidelines would allow any company crying they "may terminate or substantially curtail [their] programming" or "[curtail] other activities important to [their] mission" if forced to caption would open the door to almost any company seeking an exemption. Please consider tightening the new proposed exemptions and making them as specific as possible to avoid the obvious potential for widespread abuse of the relaxed rules.

Sincerely,
Bill Greene
356 Georgian Rd.
La Canada, CA 91011

Get your own web address for just \$1.99/1st yr. We'll help. Yahoo! Small Business.

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 26 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: Bernadette Hasenberg [gramabern@webtv.net]
To: Monica Desai
Cc:
Subject: Closed captians
Attachments:

Sent: Fri 10/13/2006 5:34 PM

Please exempt no one from providing captions and I demand you follow fed
proceures regarding notification policy changes. your primary concern
must be what will benefit our citizens

caption

FILED/ACCEPTED**OCT 26 2006**Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: Anna O'Brien [aobrien@norcalcenter.org]
To: Monica Desai
Cc:
Subject: chairman/commissioners
Attachments:

Sent: Thu 9/14/2006 5:17 PM**FILED/ACCEPTED****OCT 26 2006**Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Chairman/Commissioner

I am appalled that this unfortunate event has to take place, the FCC has decided to cut down more shows without captions. This will affect greatly to our future. The deaf community is growing larger and we are in need to understand the reality of TV shows just like everyone else does. Put yourself in our shoes, if the world could be in reverse having the majority of deaf population and small percentage of hearing people. How are you suppose to understand sign language on television? Is it really fair to you to be forced to learn sign language just as we have to be forced to lip read? Being deaf is something that we cannot change but we CAN change by improvising the future. You are our future. Don't take something away from us that we rely on the most is understanding communication via captions. Its already difficult enough being deaf having to face communication barriers and a list long of discrimination that comes every single day but to have this caption remove from FCC, it'll just enrage more people because we feel lost without understanding what's happening. It's the 21st century, its time to adapt 2 completely separated worlds into one together. Make this a unity for each one of all. Make this work for us, please. Thanks.

Anna O'Brien

Instructor - EXCEL Program

NorCal Center on Deafness

(916) 349-7500

aobrien@norcalcenter.org

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: Al Sonnenstrahl [sonny@pobox.com] **Sent:** Sat 9/23/2006 12:01 AM
To: Jonathan Adelstein; Kevin Martin; Deborah Tate; Michael Copps; Robert McDowell
Cc: Monica Desai; 'Al Sonnenstrahl'
Subject: Good Cause? Public Interest?
Attachments:

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 26 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Commissioners:

Your letters waiving the petitioners from having their programs closed captioned state the following:

"FN5 Section 79.1(f) sets forth certain procedures to guide the Commission's consideration of undue burden petitions, including that the Petition be placed on Public Notice and the Petition contain detailed facts supported by affidavit. 47 CFR S.79.1(f)(5)-(9). The Commission, however, may waive its rules for good cause, and, in light of the facts set forth in your petition and the precedent discussed above, we conclude that waiving these requirements in the instant case is consistent with the public interest."

Does this mean that it would be a good cause to discriminate against people with hearing disabilities by waiving the closed captioning requirements?

Does this mean it would be a good cause to discriminate against people with hearing disabilities by allowing the programmers to spend all they want on audios, not closed captions?

Does it mean that it would be a good cause to exclude audios from the programmers, too?

Does this mean that it is the public interest to deny people with hearing disabilities from the church?

I am hopeful that you will reverse your discriminatory decision before the media enters the arena.

Alfred Sonnenstrahl
10910 Brewer House Rd
Rockville, MD 20852

sonny@pobox.com
800-

Pam Gregory

Docket No. 06-181

From: Toninette Clark [toninette@neb.rr.com]
To: Monica Desai
Cc:
Subject: Re: DA 06-1802, CGB-CC-0005 and CGB-CC-0007
Attachments:

Sent: Wed 10/18/2006 1:12 PM**FILED/ACCEPTED****OCT 26 2006**Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

October 18, 2006

FCC Chief, Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau Monica Desai

Dear Monica Desai,

I protest the FCC approval of almost 300 requests for new programs to be shown without closed captions.

The FCC weakened the closed captioning rules, and appears to have created new standards and new rules for permitting programs to be televised without closed captions. I believe the FCC violated the closed captioning rules.

People who are deaf or hard of hearing want access to televised information and entertainment, just like everyone else.

Closed captioning is an essential part of any televised program. Captioning is not too difficult or too expensive.

I cannot watch television programs that are not captioned.

Please reconsider these FCC decisions and support closed captioning.

Sincerely,

Toninette Clark
4110 S 30th Street
Lincoln, NE 68502-5905

Docket No 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: qahmed [qahmed@neo.rr.com]
To: Monica Desai
Cc:
Subject: Closed Captioning being threatened.
Attachments:

Sent: Wed 10/18/2006 2:54 PM

Monica,
This is in Re DA06-1802, CGB-CC-0005 and CGB-CC-0007

I am protesting the recent Orders granting exemptions from closed captioning issued by CGB. These Orders appear to create a new regulation, carving out a new exemption basis, not in keeping with current regulations. We are outraged and believe the FCC has created a loophole that almost any entity crying "it costs too much" can now use. Please reconsider immediately! We need our closed captioning!

Sincerely,
Bonnie Ahmed
1769 Stoneyridge Ct
Mansfield, Ohio 44904

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 26 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: MARK BOWMAN [elkcamp@verizon.net] **Sent:** Tue 10/17/2006 7:25 PM
To: Kevin Martin
Cc: Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; Monica Desai
Subject: Re: DA 06-1802, CGB-CC-0005 and CGB-CC-0007
Attachments:

Re: DA 06-1802, CGB-CC-0005 and CGB-CC-0007

Dear FCC Chairman, I protest the recent Orders granting exemptions from closed captioning issued by CGB. These Orders appear to create a new regulation, carving out a new exemption basis, not in keeping with current regulations. We are outraged and believe the FCC has created a loophole that almost any entity crying "it costs too much" can now use. Please reconsider immediately! We need our closed captioning! Please turn your television on, turn the sound all the way down and see how what TV is like for the tens of thousands deaf and hard of hearing Americans WITHOUT Closed-Captioning. Most of the time you will not be able to understand what is being said or what is happening, cutting off a major communication source for those that are unable to hear. Hearing Impaired people are also voters.

Thank you,
Sherry A. Cochran

4755 39th Ave. S.

Seattle, WA 98118

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 26 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: Linnybopeep@aol.com [Linnybopeep@aol.com] **Sent:** Wed 10/18/2006 2:41 PM
To: Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; Monica Desai
Cc:
Subject: (no subject)
Attachments:

Dear FCC Commissioner,

I protest the recent Orders granting exemptions from closed captioning issued by CGB. These Orders appear to create a new regulation, carving out a new exemption basis, not in keeping current regulations. We are outraged and believe the FCC has created a loophole that almost any entity crying "it costs too much" can now use. Please reconsider immediately! We need our closed captioning desperately! I am 50 % deaf in both ears and require closed captioning completely to follow my favorite TV programs. I grew up never understanding what was going on with television programs and it made me feel unintelligent. The closed captioning has given me new confidence in myself and my intelligence, ie; I can now guess who the murderer is on my favorite mystery shows. There are still some channels that do not provide closed captioning like the Discovery Channel, and it greatly disappoints me as I want to watch these shows but cannot understand. I can only look at the pictures! Please don't give more channel stations license to take away anymore from me and others like myself. It is not fair and a form of prejudice.

Thank-you very much for your attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,
Linda Rouillard

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 26 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: GEORGIA LEWIS [georgiadlewis@verizon.net] **Sent:** Tue 10/17/2006 2:40 PM
To: Kevin Martin; Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; Monica Desai
Cc: salewis@snlp.net
Subject: Exemptions to Closed Captioning and Video Description
Attachments:

I am writing in support of requiring video description and closed captioning without exception. Please do not dilute these requirements by allowing exemptions. Do not deny disabled people access to full programming and especially do not deny them access to the emergency information that is available to others. This country should take seriously its heritage and historic commitment to equality for all.

Sincerely,
Georgia Lewis

FILED/ACCEPTED**OCT 26 2006**

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Docket 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: Christina Nicolaou [cn_gr2@hotmail.com]
To: Monica Desai
Cc:
Subject: Re: DA 06-1802, CGB-CC-0005 and CGB-CC-0007
Attachments:

Sent: Wed 10/18/2006 12:12 PM

October 18, 2006

FCC Chief, Consumer & Governmental Affairs Bureau Monica Desai

FILED/ACCEPTED**OCT 26 2006**Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Monica Desai,

I protest the FCC approval of almost 300 requests for new programs to be shown without closed captions.

The FCC weakened the closed captioning rules, and appears to have created new standards and new rules for permitting programs to be televised without closed captions. I believe the FCC violated the closed captioning rules.

People who are deaf or hard of hearing want access to televised information and entertainment, just like everyone else.

Closed captioning is an essential part of any televised program. Captioning is not too difficult or too expensive.

I cannot watch television programs that are not captioned.

Please reconsider these FCC decisions and support closed captioning.

Sincerely,

Christina Nicolaou
 604 Pine Valley Drive
 Bowling Green, OH 43402-5203

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: Marjorie Eiseman [marjorie.eiseman@gmail.com]
To: Monica Desai
Cc:
Subject: CC
Attachments:

Sent: Mon 9/25/2006 4:39 PM

As a severely hearing impaired person, I am greatly upset at the loopholes the FCC is allowing for television programs that have been providing Closed Captioning. Captioning has brought people like me back into the mainstream of living as others do, with news, entertainment, and educational programs available to us on a daily basis. Please do not allow this to happen.

Marjorie Eiseman

FILED/ACCEPTED**OCT 26 2006**Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: Meriah Hudson [mhudson@berkeley.edu] **Sent:** Mon 10/9/2006 3:09 PM
To: Kevin Martin; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell; Monica Desai
Cc:
Subject: re: FCC Accountability
Attachments:

Dear Chairman and Commissioners:

I am shocked to learn that the FCC has made a decision to grant a large number of captioning exemptions, and that the FCC does not believe it appropriate to hold major market broadcasters responsible for captioning life-saving emergency information in the midst of disasters. This is appalling, both to myself as a deaf person, and to those whom I know are deaf or hard of hearing. What kind of society are you helping to shape? One that consciously cares for all, or one that is completely pro-corporate, profit-driven?

The deaf who rely on closed captions may very well die in the event of a natural disaster, one in which they will be reliant on information conveyed. Radios not being an option, most deaf turn to television. Should the television report not be closed captioned, they will not be able to learn what needs to be done, what is going on.

I ask that this decision be reversed. Immediately. Will you simply stand to the side and let this happen, when you know that lives of people are at stake? Or will you do something about it? Reverse the decision today.

Meriah Hudson
415-200-8334

FILED/ACCEPTED**OCT 26 2006**

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: NancyJean Eubanks [NJEubanks@msn.com] **Sent:** Sat 9/23/2006 1:22 PM
To: Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell; Michael Copps; Monica Desai; Jonathan Adelstein
Cc:
Subject: Captioning Exemptions
Attachments:

Dear Commissioners-

I was greatly disturbed and frustrated with the recent exemption granted to Anglers for Christ and New Beginnings Ministries. I am appalled that a Christian organization would request an exemption, thereby excluding the Deaf community and aghast that the commission would approve such an exemption. This disastrous ruling opens the door for more exemptions and infringes on the rights of Deaf Americans.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

NancyJean Eubanks
Pastor, Front Range Deaf Assembly
Commissioner, CO Commission for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 26 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Docket No. 06-181

Central Middle School
44W303 Plato Rd.
Burlington, IL 60109
October 13, 2006

Dear Commissioner of the FCC,

Hello, my name is Kristina Neville. I am a Hearing Itinerant Teacher and Sign Language Interpreter. I work at Burlington Central School District. My caseload consists of 8 students, deaf and hard of hearing, who all rely on closed captions when watching television or movies. Typically, for hard of hearing students, watching television turns into a stressful situation, if they watching television without any captions. Background noise and the variety characters' voices can really confuse the students. And thus, the meaning of the television show is lost. If the captions were on, the student could read the message and then understand the meaning involved.

One of my students, who is profoundly deaf, also uses a sign language interpreter during school. She is very dependent on the captions for understanding television or movies. Many of the movies are educationally relevant movies. The movies aid to her total comprehension of the content presented in school. There have been many times when I had to interpret for a movie. My student feels that it is difficult to watch an interpreter and the screen and still be able to follow the story and understand characters and events. I believe that giving deaf and hard of hearing students the access to all information is crucial to their success in life now and as adults. Please consider these students when making decisions regarding the funding of closed captions.

Sincerely,

Kristina Neville
Hearing Itinerant Teacher
(847)-464-6000

FILED/ACCEPTED



OCT 26 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Docket No. 06-181

Attachments can contain viruses that may harm your computer. Attachments may not display correctly.

Pam Gregory

From: Neville, Kristina [kneville@burlington.k12.il.us] **Sent:** Fri 10/13/2006 2:53 PM
To: Kevin Martin; Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell; Michael Copps; Jonathon.Adelstein@fcc.gov; Monica Desai
Cc:
Subject: closed captions
Attachments:  fcc-neville.doc(21KB)  FCC paper.doc(20KB)

Hello FCC commissioner,
Please read the following attachments regarding closed captioning. We appreciate your time as we have taken the time to write these letters.

Sincerely,
Ms. Neville
Kailey Krebs

FILED/ACCEPTED**OCT 26 2006**

Kristina Neville
Hearing Itinerant Teacher
C.C.U.S.D. 301
P.O. Box 397
44W303 Plato Rd.
Burlington, IL 60109
(847) 464-6000

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

This email message (including all attachments) is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure, copying, or distribution is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

Docket No. 06-181

Central Middle School
44W303 Plato Rd.
Burlington, IL 60109
October 13, 2006

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 26 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Dear Commissioner of the FCC,

Hello, my name is Kailey Krebs. I'm 12 year old and I go to Central Middle School. I am a student and I need captions to watch t.v. I need them because it so important to me. I read the captions on t.v. and I understand what the t.v. said with the captions. I use it when I watch Cannel One and watch movies and use it at home. I don't like to look back and fort because my eyes hurt looking at the interpreted for movies or Channel One. Please don't cut down the Captions I like they to use it on t.v and movies.

From,
Kailey Krebs

Sent via teacher's E-mail

Kneville @ burlington.k12.il.us

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: PBelflower@aol.com [PBelflower@aol.com]
To: Monica Desai
Cc:
Subject: FCC Rule 47 CFR Part 79.1(d) is being exploited
Attachments:

Sent: Fri 9/22/2006 9:23 AM

Please stop the floodgate of bogus captioning exemptions for religious and other programming. The recent FCC exemptions fly in the face of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and the FCC rules regarding captioning of programming. These exemptions set unearned precedent not to caption and a true hardship for the deaf and hard-of-hearing population who have waited until 2006 for full captioned programming to finally come into being, to now witness the FCC exempting programming for invalid and nondocumentable reasons, so that the producers of the exempted programming can put more dollars in their pockets, despite law and the FCC rules to the contrary.

The FCC sides with the programmer, when it ignores its own rules. FCC Rule 47 CFR Part 79.1(d) is being exploited with the FCC's assistance.

Peggy Belflower

FILED/ACCEPTED**OCT 26 2006****Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary**

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: Penny Wolfsohn [pwolfsohn@sbcglobal.net]**Sent:** Mon 9/25/2006 8:57 PM**To:** Monica Desai**Cc:****Subject:** need for captioning**Attachments:**

It is essential for me to have captioning. I won't know what is going on and how I need to participate in my community, the state and the Country..Please do not discontinue the captioning...in fact exetend it so people with hearing loss can be included in the world...
thanks,Penny Wolfsohn Santa Rose, California.

FILED/ACCEPTED

OCT 26 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: PRausch [vermontflyer02@yahoo.com] **Sent:** Thu 9/28/2006 12:39 PM
To: Kevin Martin; Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; Monica Desai
Cc:
Subject: Changes in Closed captioning!
Attachments:

Dear Sirs and Ma'am,

I protest the September 13th, changes in the Close Captioning system. I am Deaf, and no amount of funding will change that!

Leave captioning alone! In fact it needs to be improved!

Peter J. Rausch
Vernon, VT 05354

Talk is cheap. Use Yahoo! Messenger to make PC-to-Phone calls. Great rates starting at 1¢/min.

FILED/ACCEPTED
OCT 26 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Docket No. 06-181

Pam Gregory

From: PT Newton [paulinenewton@comcast.net] **Sent:** Fri 9/15/2006 1:04 PM
To: Kevin Martin; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; Deborah Tate; Robert McDowell; Monica Desai
Cc:
Subject:
Attachments:

Dear Mr. Martin, Mr. Copps, Mr. Adelstein, Ms. Tate, Mr. McDowell and Ms. Desai:

I am a professor at Southern Methodist University in Dallas, TX, and I rely on captions 100% to keep abreast of current events, entertainment and educational materials for my students, to name a few items.

Programmers have had over ten years to find finding and to get set up to caption programs. The decision to grant approximately 700 exemptions is in poor taste. Your attention should be geared toward helping the programmers in question to caption their programs.

People with disabilities need equal access to programs. Why not turn the sound off next time you watch television, especially when an event like 9.11 happens and determine how much information you can glean?

Sincerely,

Dr. Pauline T. Newton
Southern Methodist University
Department of Rhetoric
P.O. Box 750435
Dallas, TX 75275
214.768.1956
<http://faculty.smu.edu/pnewton>

FILED/ACCEPTED
OCT 26 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary